



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/586,410	06/01/2000	Mark Clark	00 P 7661 US	6338

7590 12/22/2004

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

NAHAR, QAMRUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/586,410	Applicant(s) CLARK ET AL.	
	Examiner Qamrun Nahar	Art Unit 2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 8/6/04.
2. The objection to claim 2 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention to claims 1-18 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
5. Claims 1-2, 6, 11 and 16 have been amended.
6. Claims 1-18 are pending.
7. Claims 2, 12 and 17 stand finally objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.
8. Claims 16-18 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
9. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12 and 16-17 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) in view of Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583).
10. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) in view of Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583), and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA).

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

11. Claims 2, 12 and 17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. These claims substantially recite, "language comprising an Abstract Syntax Notation One standard", however, this limitation has been added in the independent claims 1, 11 and 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "said machine readable language" in lines 6-7 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Therefore, this limitation is interpreted as "said computer-readable program language".

Claims 17-18 are rejected for dependency upon rejected base claim 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) in view of Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583).

Per Claim 1 (Amended):

Chang teaches a system ("system" in column 2, lines 46-47 and Fig. 1), comprising: a translator adapted to translate between extended grammar constructs of a machine readable language and basic grammar constructs of said machine readable language ("pre-compiler" in column 2, lines 53-68 to column 3, lines 1-6, pre-compiler is interpreted as a translator; supplemental language is interpreted as extended grammar constructs; and host language is interpreted as basic grammar constructs), wherein a translation comprises reading a source file containing extended grammar constructs, performing a lookup table conversion of said source file of extended grammar constructs into a basic source file containing only basic grammar constructs (column 3, lines 1-6; column 4, lines 55-68 to column 5, lines 1-21; and see Fig. 2); and a compiler coupled to receive an output of said translator for compiling code written in said basic grammar constructs ("The modified source file 22 can then be compiled by a host language compiler 24" in column 3, lines 13-16). Chang does not explicitly teach that the machine readable language being ASN.1. Bapat teaches that the machine readable language being ASN.1

Art Unit: 2124

(column 3, lines 10-16 and see Fig. 20, item 14 “ASN.1 SOURCE FILES WITH OBJECT CLASS DEFINITIONS”; ASN.1 source files contain ASN.1 grammar constructs, which is compiled into machine readable language).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Chang to include the machine readable language being ASN.1 using the teaching of Bapat. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use standardized data structure protocol.

Per Claim 2 (Amended):

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Bapat further teaches that the machine readable language comprises the Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1) standard (column 3, lines 10-16 and see Fig. 20, item 14 “ASN.1 SOURCE FILES WITH OBJECT CLASS DEFINITIONS”; ASN.1 source files contain ASN.1 grammar constructs, which is compiled into machine readable language).

Per Claim 6 (Amended):

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “a first source file” (column 2, lines 59-60), and “a second source file” (column 3, lines 3-6). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Art Unit: 2124

Per Claim 7:

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 2, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above.

Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claim 11 (Amended):

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above.

Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claim 12:

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 2, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above.

Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claim 16 (Amended):

This is a computer-readable computer program product version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “wherein said computer-readable program code is adapted to directly translate said extended grammar constructs into said basic grammar constructs by using one or more lookup tables” (column 3, lines 1-6 and Fig. 1, item 36). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Art Unit: 2124

Per Claim 17:

This is a computer-readable computer program product version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 2, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

16. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) in view of Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583), and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA).

Per Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, neither Chang nor Bapat explicitly teaches that the basic grammar constructs comprises X.680 grammar constructs. AAPA teaches that the basic grammar constructs comprises X.680 grammar constructs (pg. 1, line 32).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by the combination of Chang and Bapat to include the basic grammar constructs comprising X.680 grammar constructs using the teaching of AAPA. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use a common basic compiler.

Per Claim 4:

Art Unit: 2124

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, neither Chang nor Bapat explicitly teaches that the extended grammar constructs comprises at least one of X.681, X.682, or X.683 grammar constructs. AAPA teaches that the extended grammar constructs comprises at least one of X.681, X.682, or X.683 grammar constructs (pg. 1, lines 27-31).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by the combination of Chang and Bapat to include the extended grammar constructs comprising at least one of X.681, X.682, or X.683 grammar constructs using the teaching of AAPA. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to develop applications using other grammar constructs.

Per Claim 5:

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and Chang further teaches that the translator comprising one or more lookup tables (column 3, lines 1-6 and Fig. 1, item 36).

Per Claim 8:

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 4, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claim 9:

Art Unit: 2124

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 3, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above.

Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claim 10:

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 5, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “equivalent constructs” (Chang, column 3, lines 1-6). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claims 13-15:

These are method versions of the claimed system discussed above (claims 3, 4, and 5, respectively), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Per Claim 18:

This is a computer-readable computer program product version of the claimed system discussed above (claims 3 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/6/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

a) Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Chang, U.S. Patent No. 5,230,049 ("Chang"). In order for there to be anticipation, each and every element of the claimed invention must be present in a single prior reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Chang.

As discussed in the Specification, a computer system according to an implementation of the invention implements a translator and a compiler for compiling a machine readable language, such as ASN.1. When a source file is provided, the system performs a line-by-line compare to determine if the file contains extended grammar constructs of the language. If not, then the source file is compiled. If so, however, then the source file is input to the translator to translate the source file into basic grammar constructs.

Thus, the claims have been amended to recite "said machine readable language being ASN.1, wherein a translation comprises reading a source file containing extended grammar constructs, performing a lookup table conversion of said source file of extended grammar constructs into a basic source file containing only basic grammar constructs."

In contrast, as acknowledged in the Official Action, Chang does not relate to extended and basic ASN.1 grammar constructs. Instead, Chang relates to providing source code statements in a host language (e.g., C or Cobol) and including statements in a supplemental language (e.g.,

Art Unit: 2124

SOL). The SOL statements are extracted, converted into a "language independent format" and then into the host language. Not only are these not basic and extended ASN.1 grammar constructs, the compiled language does not comprise "basic constructs."

Furthermore, applicants respectfully disagree that the "supplemental" and "host" languages of Chang are comparable to the extended and basic grammar constructs of the present invention. As discussed in the Specification, aspects of the present invention relate to allowing a standard compiler to be used with extended constructs of a same machine readable language by translating into basic constructs. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Examiner's response:

a) The combination of Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) and Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583) teaches the added limitation, "said machine readable language being ASN.1, wherein a translation comprises reading a source file containing extended grammar constructs, performing a lookup table conversion of said source file of extended grammar constructs into a basic source file containing only basic grammar constructs", see the rejection above in paragraph 15 for rejection to claims 1, 6, 11 and 16.

As previously pointed out in the last two Office Actions, Paper Nos. 5 and 9, and maintained by the Examiner, Chang teaches a translator ("pre-compiler" in column 2, lines 53-68 to column 3, lines 1-6, pre-compiler is interpreted as a translator; supplemental language is interpreted as extended grammar constructs; and host language is interpreted as basic grammar constructs).

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

b) Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bapat, U.S. Patent No. 5,291,583 ("Bapat"). Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Chang or Bapat, either singly or in combination. Bapat is relied on for allegedly teaching ASN.1 as "a machine readable language." Bapat, however, relates merely to "storing ASN.1 object instances in a relational database language such as SOL." Col. 1, lines 21-22. Like Chang, Bapat appears to have nothing to do with translating extended grammar constructs directly into basic grammar constructs, as generally recited in the claims at issue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Examiner's response:

b) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that the combination of Chang and Bapat fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 2, 7, 12 and 17. Bapat clearly shows each and every limitation in claims 2, 7, 12 and 17. As previously pointed out in the last two Office Actions, Paper Nos. 5 and 9, Bapat is relied upon for the limitation "the machine readable language comprises the Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1) standard" (column 3, lines 10-16 and see Fig. 20, item 14 "ASN.1 SOURCE FILES WITH OBJECT CLASS DEFINITIONS"; ASN.1 source files contain ASN.1 grammar constructs, which is compiled into machine readable language).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). That is, Chang is relied upon for the limitation translating extended grammar constructs into basic grammar constructs, not Bapat.

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 15 for rejection to claims 2, 7, 12 and 17.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

c) Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bapat and further in view of "Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APAA)," Chang and Bapat have been discussed above. Applicant Admitted Prior Art is indicated to merely specify particular ASN.1 grammar extensions. Because, however, APAA fails to relate in any way to a translator as recited in the claims at issue (indeed, that is a very object of the present invention), its combination with Chang and Bapat likewise falls to teach, suggest or imply the present invention. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Examiner's response:

c) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that the combination of Chang, Bapat, and AAPA fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and

Art Unit: 2124

18. The combination of Chang, Bapat, and AAPA clearly shows each and every limitation in claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). That is, Chang is relied upon for the limitation translator, not Bapat or AAPA.

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 16 for rejection to claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QN
December 9, 2004



TODD INGBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER